

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephonic interview on November 4, 2010 and December 16, 2010. Applicants' representative Nancy Swiezynski discussed aspects of the claims in view of Hansen et al. (US Patent No. 5,659,693) and Leong (US Patent No. 5,513,342). In particular, the Examiner agreed that the claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10-16, 19-22, and 24-26 as amended herein to clarify the manual resizing mode are allowable over the applied references. In particular, the Examiner agreed that neither of the applied references discloses an automatic mode and a manual mode as recited by the claims in which resizing one of the tiles during the manual mode does not cause the other tiles to be resized. Additionally, Applicants discussed clarifying amendments to be made to claims 27-46 so that they are allowable over the cited references.

As such, this Amendment E amends claims 1, 5-8, 10, 15, 20, 24, 27, 31-33, 37, 40, 41, and 43-46, and cancels claims 4, 9, and 23. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the amended application in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Claims 1-3-5, 8-9, 12, 14-16, and 19-23

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-9, 12, 14-16, and 19-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,659,693 to Hansen et al. (Hansen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,513,342 to Leong et al (Leong). Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claims.

As discussed below, aspects of the present application relate to sizing a tile within a sidebar. Applicants provide for both automatic and manual resizing of tiles within the sidebar without requiring the resizing the sidebar itself. In particular, Applicants "allow both [an] application to choose its own size and allow users to override that size." (Application, page 2, lines 24-25). Accordingly, Applicants "make[] it possible to build tiles that use an appropriate amount of space, wherein users are able to stop poorly designed tiles from taking up too much space" in a particularly sized sidebar (Application, page 2, lines 25-27).

Claims 1, 8, 15, and 20 have been amended to specify that during the manual mode, a user may size a tile up to a predetermined maximum size limit without causing the other tiles in the sidebar to be resized. For example, Figure 4 illustrates a scenario when a user has made tile 310 smaller. Since the remaining tiles in the sidebar are not resized accordingly, additional available space 500 is created in the sidebar. (See Application, page 9, lines 25-29). In the scenario where the user attempts to resize the tile beyond the predetermined maximum size limit, "the tile simply stops resizing if the user tries to make it bigger than the maximum size." (Application, page 3, lines 18-19).

In particular, amended claim 1 recites "a manual sizing routine which allows a user, during a manual mode, to manually set the size of the tile up to the predetermined maximum size limit within the sidebar without the one or more other tiles being resized as a function thereof." Claim 8 recites "a manual sizing component for allowing a user, during a manual mode, to manually size the tile up to the predetermined maximum size limit within the sidebar and without the one or more other tiles being resized as a function thereof." Claim 15 recites "a second routine for allowing a user, during a manual mode, to manually resize the tile up to the predetermined maximum size limit within the sidebar without resizing the sidebar and without the one or more other tiles being resized as a function thereof." Claim 20 recites a method that "allow[s] a user to manually set the size of the tile up to the predetermined maximum size limit within the sidebar without resizing the sidebar and without the one or more other tiles being resized as a function thereof."

Neither of the references whether read together or separately disclose each feature of claims 1, 8, 15, and 20. **In particular, as agreed by the Examiner in the December 16, 2010 interview, neither of the references discloses a manual mode that allows a user to size a tile up to a predetermined maximum size limit without causing the other tiles in the sidebar to be resized.**

Hansen discloses two methods for resizing a tile. First, Hansen discloses that the tiles can be resized as a group by manually resizing the dashboard interface. Specifically, Hansen teaches that all of the tiles located within the dashboard interface are proportionately resized when the user resizes the dashboard interface. (See Hansen, col. 6, lines 35-39). Thus, this method of sizing a tile requires both that the sidebar be resized and that the other tiles be resized.

Second, Hansen discloses that the tiles located in the dashboard interface can be individually manually resized by a user. (See Hansen, col. 5, lines 19-28). A comparison of FIGS. 14 and 15 illustrates that the dashboard interface is accordingly enlarged to accommodate the enlarged printer manager panel. Thus, this method also requires that the sidebar be resized. Neither method teaches or suggests that the tiles may have a predetermined maximum size limit. To the contrary, as discussed above, Hansen teaches resizing the sidebar to accommodate a larger tile size. As such, Hansen fails to teach the features of claims 1, 8, 15, and 20 which allow a user during a manual mode, to manually set the size of the tile within the sidebar up to a predetermined maximum size limit without resizing the sidebar and without resizing tiles.

Leong also fails to teach this feature since Leong merely discloses an automatic sizing mode. Thus, Hansen and Leong, whether read together or separately, fail to disclose each and every element of amended independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 20. Accordingly, as agreed by the Examiner in the December 16, 2010 interview, the amended independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 20 are allowable in view of the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that claims depending, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 20 are allowable for at least the same reasons that the independent claims from which they depend is allowable.

B. Claims 27-31, 33, 34, 38-41, 42, and 46

Claims 27-31, 33, 34, 38-41, 42, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Leong in view of U.S Patent No. 5,363,481 to Tilt (Tilt). Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claims.

B1. Claim 27

Claim 27 is directed to a method for sizing a tile displaying content on a display. The method includes, in part, "automatically resizing the tile within the sidebar without resizing the sidebar based at least in part on changes in the first content," "tracking an amount of time that has elapsed since the tile has been most recently automatically resized" and "automatically additionally resizing the tile within the sidebar without resizing the sidebar based at least in part on changes in the first content." "[T]he automatic additional resizing of the tile is permitted when the amount of time that has elapsed since the tile has been most recently resized is greater

than a predetermined time interval, and wherein the tile is prevented from being automatically additionally resized otherwise." The method includes "providing the resized tile within the sidebar having the defined size on the display, said resized tile displaying second content." Thus, claim 27 has been amended to highlight that the method tracks the amount of time between resizing events and determines whether the tile may be resized based on the amount of time is the last resizing event. As such, the method of claim 27 prevents a tile from changing size too frequently, which could be distracting or annoying to a user. (Application, page 4, lines 11-12).

The Office correctly notes that neither Hansen nor Leong discloses determining whether a tile should be resized based on the amount of time between sequential sizing events. (Office action, page 7). Tilt fails to cure the deficiencies of Hansen and Leong. Tilt merely teaches that a timer is initiated when a user selects a knob for scrolling through a menu. As long as the knob is being turned the timer is restarted. When the knob is no longer being turned the timer is permitted to count until it expires. When the timer expires, the menu is closed, taking the menu off the display. (Tilt, col. 2, lines 24-33). **In other words, Tilt teaches tracking an amount of time since a user selects a menu control, not the "amount of time that has elapsed since the tile has been most recently resized" as recited by claim 27.**

As such Tilt, like Hansen and Leong, fails to teach or suggest "tracking an amount of time that has elapsed since the tile has been resized" and "automatically resizing the tile when the amount of time that has elapsed since the tile has been resized is greater than a predetermined time interval, and wherein the tile is prevented from being automatically resized otherwise" as recited by claim 27. In view of the foregoing, the cited references, whether read alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 27. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of amended claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims that depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 27 are allowable for at least the reasons that the independent claim from which they depend is allowable.

B2. Claims 33 and 41

Claim 33 is directed to a computer-readable medium having computer executable components for sizing a tile. Claim 41 is directed to a system for resizing a tile on a computer display. Claims 33 and 41 each include an element for "automatically resizing the tile within the

sidebar without resizing the sidebar" and "tracking an amount of time that has elapsed since the tile has been most recently resized." Additionally, both claims provide that "permit additional automatic resizing of the tile when the amount of time that has elapsed since the tile has been most recently resized is greater than a predetermined time interval, and wherein the tile is prevented from being automatically resized otherwise."

Thus, for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with claim 27, Hansen, Leong, and Tilt, whether read alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of amended claims 33 and 41. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of amended claims 33 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims that depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claims 33 and 41, respectively, are allowable for at least the reasons that the independent claims from which they depend are allowable.

C. Claims 6-7, 10-11, and 24-26

Claims 6-7, 10-11, 17-18, and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Leong in view of Nielsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,437,758). Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claims.

Claims 6-7; 10-11; and 24-26 depend from amended independent claims 1, 8, and 20, respectively, and add further limitations to those in claims 1, 8, and 20. Inasmuch as Nielsen merely discloses positioning information on a display and, thus, fails to cure the deficiencies of Hansen and Leong, Applicants submit that claims 6-7, 10-11, and 24-26 are allowable for at least the same reasons that amended independent claims 1, 8, and 20 are allowable.

D. Claims 32, 37, and 43-45

Claims 32, 37, and 43-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Leong in view of Tilt and in further view of Nielsen. Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claims.

Claims 32; 37, and 43-45 depend from amended independent claims 27, 33, and 41 respectively, and add further limitations to those in claims 27, 33, and 41. Tilt relates to tracking

an amount of time since a user selects a menu control, and closing the window in response accordingly. Because Tilt fails to cure the deficiencies of Hansen, Leong, and Nielsen as explained above, Applicants submit that claims 32, 37, and 43-45 are allowable for at least the same reasons that amended independent claims 27, 33, and 41 are allowable.

E. Claim 40

Claim 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Leong in view of Tilt and in further view of Southgate (U.S. Patent No. 5,880,725). Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claim.

Claim 40 depends from amended independent claim 33, and adds further limitations to those in claim 33. Southgate is directed to resizing a plurality of windows on a display, which is completely different than resizing tiles within a single sidebar on the display. Thus, Southgate fails to cure the deficiencies of the other applied references. As such, Applicants submit that claim 40 is allowable for at least the same reasons that amended independent claim 33 is allowable.

F. Claim 13

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Leong in view of Carpenter (U.S. Patent No. 5,602,997). Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claim.

Claim 13 depends from amended independent claim 8, and adds further limitations to those in claim 8. Carpenter teaches the same dashboard interface as taught by Hansen, and thus fails to cure the deficiencies of Hansen and Leong for the reasons discussed above. As such, Applicants submit that claim 13 is allowable for at least the same reasons that amended independent claim 8 is allowable.

G. Claims 35-36

Claims 35-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Leong in view of Tilt and in further view of Carpenter. Applicants respectfully disagree.

None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claims.

Claims 35-36 depend from amended independent claim 33, and add further limitations to those in claim 33. As such, Applicants submit that claims 35-36 are allowable for at least the same reasons that amended independent claim 33 is allowable.

Conclusion

Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nancy A. Swiezynski/

Nancy A. Swiezynski, Reg. No. 65,936
SENNIGER POWERS LLP
100 North Broadway, 17th Floor
St. Louis, MO 63102
(314) 345-7000

NAS/lav